



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,759	07/01/2003	David Kays	303815.01	5909
22971	7590	06/04/2007		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			EXAMINER HUYNH, THU V	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,759	Applicant(s) KAYS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thu V. Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 10-12, 19-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE and amendment filed on 12/21/06 to application filed on 07/01/03.
2. Claims 1, 16 and 18 are currently amended. Claims 19-28 are currently added. Claims 5-9 and 13-15 are canceled.
3. Claims 1-4, 10-12, 16-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13 and 16 are independent claims.
4. The rejections of claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph in the previous office action, have been withdrawn as necessitated in view of the amendment.
5. The rejections of claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph in the previous office action, have been withdrawn as necessitated in view of the amendment.
6. The rejections of claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter in the previous office action, have been withdrawn as necessitated in view of the amendment.

Specification

7. The description portion of this application contains a computer program listing consisting of more than three hundred (300) lines. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.96(c), a computer program listing of more than three hundred lines must be submitted as a computer program listing appendix on compact disc conforming to the standards set forth in 37 CFR 1.96(c)(2) and must be appropriately referenced in the specification (see 37 CFR 1.77(b)(5)). Accordingly, applicant is required to cancel the computer program listing

Art Unit: 2178

appearing in appendix, file a computer program listing appendix on compact disc in compliance with 37 CFR 1.96(c) and insert an appropriate reference to the newly added computer program listing appendix on compact disc at the beginning of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Beadles et al., US 2003/0154404 A1, filed 08/02, in view of Prabakaran et al., US

2002/0178249 A1, filed 03/02, Prabakaran et al., US 2002/0178249 A1, filed 03/03/02 and

Clark et al., US 2004/0110118 A1, filed 11/23/01.

Regarding independent claim 16, Beadles teaches the steps of:

- providing a schema that describes group policy object settings (Beadles, [0054]; [0062]-[0064], [0109]; providing many types of XML schemas, such as XML device schema, VPN policy rule schema, wherein XML device schema describes different policies for different devices, so that XML policy document (“new device-level XML

- document”) is generated for each device as defined by the XML device schema. It is notes that an XML schema describes policies is also specified in [0054], for examples, an XML schema describes “IP service policy, including managed device policy, IPS EC policy, ... and policy for all other managed IP services”); and
- applying the schema to output a formatted version of the group policy object settings (Beadles, [0054], [0103], [0109], [0111]; using XML device schema to generate XML policy document for each device).

However, Beadles does not explicitly disclose resultant set of policy settings that identifies configured settings and omits non-configured settings; and identifying a first plurality of settings and a second plurality of settings in the resultant set of policy settings based on the schema, the first plurality of settings being configured and applied to a computing environment and the second plurality of settings not being configured and applied to a computing environment; and outputting a list of the first plurality of settings, the list omitting the second plurality of settings.

Prabakaran teaches resultant set of policy settings that identifies configured settings and omits non-configured settings (Prabakaran, [0051], [0053], [0055]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Prabakaran’s teaching into Beadles’ teaching to describe resultant set of policy settings in a schema, since the combination would have provided XML policy document for each device based on group policy object settings as well as resultant set of policy settings.

Prabakaran teaches identifying a first plurality of settings and a second plurality of settings in the resultant set of policy settings based on the schema, the first plurality of settings being configured and applied to a computing environment and the second plurality of settings not being configured and applied to a computing environment and outputting a list of the first plurality of settings and the second plurality of settings (Prabakaran, [0003], [0014], [0015], [0038]; displaying policy object settings for the user configures settings that applied to a computer environment; generating a report so that the user can know what settings have changed in two versions of a policy object).

Clark teaches reports include configurations information report and non-configurations information report (Clark, [0016]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Clark's teaching into Prabakaran's and Beadles' teaching to provide non-configurations information report, since the combination would have provided the user many type of reports that the user interested on, such as configurations information report, non-configurations information report, and differences report.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 16, the limitation of "the schema comprises an XML schema" is addressed. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Regarding dependent claim 18, claim 18 is for a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instruction (Beadles, [0041], [0046]-[0047]; system includes modules in

Art Unit: 2178

layers for performing the method of claim 16) for performing the method of claim 16, and is rejected under the same rationale. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 1-4, 10-12, 19-28 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue with respect to claims that 16-18 that Prabakaran does not teach configuring settings of a group policy object that is configured and applied to a computing environment and reporting only configured and applied to a computer environment.

Examiner agrees. However, the combination of Prabakaran (2002/0178249), Prabakaran (2002/0178249), Beadles and Clark teaches limitations of claim 1 as explained above.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Whalen et al., US 2004/0215649 A1, filed 04/03, teaches method for representing group policy object topology and relationships.

Beilinson et al., US 2004/0003279 A1, filed 06/02, teaches user controls for a computer

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thu V. Huynh
May 28, 2007